

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Adam B. Wolfson (Bar No. 262125)

2 adamwolfson@quinnemanuel.com

Ryan S. Landes (Bar No. 252642)

3 ryanlandes@quinnemanuel.com

865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor

4 Los Angeles, California 90017-2543

Telephone: (213) 443-3000

5 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Paulina Slagter (Bar No. 318559)

6 paulinaslagter@quinnemanuel.com

555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor

7 Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Telephone: (650) 801 5000

8 Facsimile: (650) 801 5100

9 *Attorneys for Plaintiff CureIS Healthcare, Inc.*

10
11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 CureIS Healthcare, Inc.,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 Epic Systems Corporation,

17 Defendant.

Case No. 3:25-cv-04108-MMC

**PLAINTIFF'S SEALING STATEMENT IN
RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER
PARTY'S MATERIAL SHOULD BE
SEALED**

Judge: Hon. Maxine M. Chesney

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 On July 25, 2025, Defendant Epic Systems Corporation (“Epic”) filed its Administrative
3 Motion to Consider Whether Another Party’s Materials Should Be Sealed (“Administrative
4 Motion”) (Dkt. 47) in connection with Epic’s Reply in Support of its Motion to Partially Unseal
5 CureIS Healthcare Inc.’s (“CureIS”) Complaint (“Epic’s Motion to Unseal Reply”) (Dkt. 46). Epic’s
6 Administrative Motion incorporates by reference the arguments made in its Notice of Motion and
7 Motion to Partially Unseal CureIS’s Complaint, which is an improper motion for reconsideration.
8 See CureIS’s Opposition to Epic’s Motion to Partially Unseal CureIS’s Complaint, Dkt. 42. As
9 explained in CureIS’s Opposition to Epic’s Motion to Partially Unseal, which is incorporated by
10 reference to this Sealing Statement, the Court already ruled that Plaintiff CureIS Healthcare Inc.
11 (“CureIS”)’s confidential customer names should be kept under seal. Dkt. 5. (“[T]he names of its
12 customers...shall be filed under seal”).

13 As explained in CureIS’s Administrative Motion to File the Complaint Under Seal (Dkt. 38),
14 and the Declaration of Chris Sawotin, submitted in support of CureIS’s sealing motion (Dkt. 38-1),
15 the names of CureIS’s customers and the existence of confidential contractual relationships would
16 harm CureIS’s competitive standing if publicly disclosed. Plaintiff CureIS therefore requests that
17 the Court maintain partially under seal certain limited information contained in Epic’s Reply in
18 Support of its Motion to Partially Unseal, filed on July 25, 2025. Dkts. 46, 47-1.

19 This sealing statement concerns largely the same content as CureIS’s May 12, 2015, July
20 14, 2025, and July 23, 2025 submissions. Dkts. 2, 40, 44. CureIS maintains the same positions and
21 confidentiality designations. The contractual relationships that Epic induced CureIS’s customers to
22 breach are confidential in themselves by their contractual terms. Further, CureIS goes to great
23 lengths to keep the identities of its customers confidential. Dkt. 38-1, Sawotin Decl. ¶ 5. Thus, there
24 are “compelling reasons” to maintain under seal customer-identifying information in Epic’s Motion
25 to Unseal Reply. Dkts. 46, 38-1.

1 **II. ARGUMENT**

2 **A. Plaintiff CureIS Requests to Maintain Under Seal the Following Information**

3 CureIS respectfully seeks to maintain under seal portions of Epic’s Motion to Unseal Reply
4 as follows:

5 Sealed Page and Line Number(s) in Epic’s Motion to Unseal Reply	6 Reasons for Sealing (Highlighted Portions Only)
7 Page 6, Fn. 4	8 Non-public and commercially sensitive information regarding CureIS’s customer relationships and confidential customer contracts
9 Page 7, Lines 8-10, 12	10 Non-public and commercially sensitive information regarding CureIS’s customer relationships and confidential customer contracts
11 Page 10, Fn. 10	12 Non-public and commercially sensitive information regarding CureIS’s customer relationships and confidential customer contracts

13
14 If publicly disclosed, the aforementioned information, which includes CureIS’s confidential
15 customers’ information, could provide competitors with a significant advantage by revealing
16 CureIS’s confidential business strategies and customer relationships. Such disclosure would enable
17 competitors to undercut CureIS’s pricing, replicate its contractual terms, or target its customers
18 directly, thereby harming CureIS’s competitive standing and jeopardizing its customer relationships.
19

20 **A. The Court Already Granted CureIS’s Request to Seal Customer-Identifying
Information**

21 On May 13, 2025, the Court granted CureIS motion to seal limited portions of its Complaint.
22 Dkt. 5. In so doing, the Court found that maintaining the confidentiality of non-public contractual
23 relationships “safeguard[s] against competitive harm” and thus “constitute[s] compelling reasons
24 that justify sealing.” *Id.* The Court also found CureIS’s sealing of customer-identifying information
25 was “narrowly tailored” and as such, ruled that customer-identifying information “shall be filed
26 under seal.” *Id.*
27
28

B. CureIS Has Already Established A Proper Basis For Sealing

The Court should maintain under seal the identified portions of Epic’s Motion to Unseal Reply because Plaintiff CureIS has already demonstrated compelling reasons for sealing. CureIS confirms that the provisional sealing of customer-identifying information in these filings is consistent with Magistrate Judge Kim’s prior order, which recognized that the identities of CureIS’s customers constitute confidential business information warranting protection from public disclosure. *See* May 13, 2025 Order, Dkt. 5 (finding that “the names of its customers” and “confidential negotiations” constitute “compelling reasons that justify sealing”); *see also* *Flextronics Int’l USA, Inc. v. Murata Mfg. Co.*, 2019 WL 13554029, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2019) (granting motion to seal “as to confidential customer identities”); *Mezzadri v. Med. Depot, Inc.*, 2015 WL 12564223, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2015) (sealing customer lists); *Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco Sys. Inc.*, 2019 WL 4168952, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2019) (sealing material revealing proprietary product functionality). As explained in the Declaration of Chris Sawotin, CureIS’s CEO (Dkt. 38-1), public disclosure of its customers’ identities and the existence of confidential contractual relationships could cause significant competitive harm to CureIS and would risk violating its contractual obligations to those customers. *Id.* ¶ 4, 5.

As with CureIS’s initial complaint, Epic’s Motion to Unseal Reply contains CureIS’s confidential customer identities and reveals the existence and terms of confidential contracts, each of which qualifies for protection under the “compelling reasons” standard. *See In re Elec. Arts, Inc.*, 298 F. App’x 568, 569 (9th Cir. 2008); *Sumotext Corp. v. Zoove, Inc.*, No. 16-CV-01370-BLF, 2020 WL 836737, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2020) (“Closely-negotiated or customer-specific terms are sealable under Ninth Circuit law, as they could be used by competitors to undercut [CureIS] or by potential customers to demand more favorable terms in negotiations.”); *Finisar Corp. v. Nistica, Inc.*, 2015 WL 3988132, at *5 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2015). CureIS maintains the confidentiality of this information through reasonable measures, including contractual restrictions and internal security protocols. Sawotin Decl., Dkt. 38-1 ¶ 5. As such, CureIS’s request to maintain under seal references to confidential customer identities and the existence of confidential contractual relationships in Epic’s Motion to Unseal Reply should be granted.

1 **III. CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, CureIS respectfully requests that the redacted portions of Epic's
3 Motion to Unseal Reply, identified above, remain under seal.

4
5 DATED: August 1, 2025

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

6
7
8 By /s/ Adam B. Wolfson

Adam B. Wolfson

9 Ryan S. Landes

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiff,*

11 *CureIS Healthcare, Inc.*